



Review of DDS Proposal

District: _____ Role Category: T A SP Reviewer: _____

Directions: Review the Guidelines, Standards, and Rubric. As you review the district's proposed system, determine whether the plan - if implemented as described – would be rated unacceptable (u), approaching (a), or on standard (s). Record notes to support your rating – particularly noting what would be necessary to meet standard.

Standard 1: District evaluation systems establish a common vision of educator quality within a district through clearly communicated evaluation processes that build upon professional standards, emphasize professional practice, impact on student learning, demonstration of professional responsibilities, and content knowledge, and support district initiatives.

	Unacceptable	Approaching Standard	On Standard
1.1a The system addresses at least the following four core personnel evaluation <i>purposes</i> : provide feedback on performance to all educators to support continuous professional development; create incentives for highly effective educators; improve the performance of or remove ineffective educators; and organize personnel resources to support organizational efforts to meet district goals.	<p>The system is not designed around clear purposes or only one or two of the primary purposes are addressed.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Procedures and policies do not support the identified purposes.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>There is little or no connection between intended purposes and the evidence that will be used to inform each stated purpose.</p>	<p>The system is designed to address three of the four primary purposes of personnel evaluation.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Procedures and policies are not designed to adequately address the stated purposes.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>There is a connection between intended purposes and the evidence that will be used to inform each stated purpose, but the connections are either not explicit or do not make a consistent connection between process and desired outcome.</p>	<p>There is evidence that the system is designed to address the four primary purposes of personnel evaluation – provide feedback and professional development for educators, create incentives for high performers, address ineffective educators, and support organizational efforts to meet district goals.</p> <p>The purposes are clearly stated and the procedures and policies support the purposes. There is an explicit connection between intended purposes and the evidence that will be used to inform each stated purpose.</p>
Evidence (Prompt B1):	<p>Rating: U A S</p> <p>Recommendations:</p>		

	Unacceptable	Approaching Standard	On Standard
1.1b The system communicates a vision of effective educators and supports this description with clear, measurable expectations for performance that distinguish among highly effective, effective, developing, and ineffective educators.	There is little or no evidence that the vision for educator effectiveness is defined through four levels of performance (highly effective, effective, effective, developing and ineffective).	NO RATING HERE – UNACCEPTABLE OR ON STANDARD ONLY	The vision for educator effectiveness is defined through descriptions for each level of performance, (highly effective, effective, developing, and ineffective). There are specific and measurable differences that distinguish between and among these performance levels.
Evidence (Prompt B2):	Rating: U A S Recommendations:		

	Unacceptable	Approaching Standard	On Standard
1.1c The system clearly identifies the ways in which evaluation data are used to demonstrate each of the four levels of effectiveness and the actions (e.g., professional development, retention, incentives, removal) that result from each rating.	<p>Evaluation outcomes are not clearly documented and the decisions and actions that result from each performance level are not clearly articulated.</p> <p>The decisions and actions are inadequate personnel actions for ineffective or developing educators.</p>	<p>Most evaluation outcomes are clearly documented and the decisions and actions that result from each performance level are generally articulated.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>The decisions and actions reflect the appropriate personnel actions for each performance level.</p>	<p>All possible evaluation outcomes are clearly documented and the decisions and actions that result from each performance level are clearly articulated.</p> <p>The decisions and actions reflect the appropriate personnel actions for each performance level.</p>
Evidence (Prompt B3):	<p>Rating: U A S</p> <p>Recommendations:</p>		

	Unacceptable	Approaching Standard	On Standard
1.2 Educator evaluation builds upon the professional standards appropriate to the educator's role in the district	The overall evaluation of each educator fails to address the majority of competencies described in the appropriate professional standards.	The overall evaluation of each educator addresses the majority of the competencies described in the appropriate professional standards but does not address the full range of competencies.	The overall evaluation of each educator addresses the full range of competencies described in the appropriate professional standards. (RIPTS, RISEL, or Support Professional Standards)
Evidence (Prompt A7):		Rating: U A S Recommendations:	

	Unacceptable	Approaching Standard	On Standard
1.3a Teachers – Quality of Instruction (RIPTS 1-9)	<p>There is little or no direct assessment of the effectiveness of quality of instruction.</p> <p>The evaluation system has few or no features that define high quality instructional practices. There is little or no link of features that define high quality instructional practices to evaluation tools and processes.</p> <p>There is little or no evidence that evaluation includes a sufficient number of high quality formal and informal classroom observations that support making valid inferences about the quality of instruction.</p> <p>There is little or no evidence that evaluation includes the protocols, processes and a rationale for a systematic review of classroom artifacts of instructional planning and activities.</p> <p>There is little or no evidence of implementation of a systematic review.</p>	<p>Educators are evaluated on the effectiveness of the quality of instruction.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>The evaluation system has general features that define high quality instructional practices and there are some links between the features and evaluation tools and processes. OR</p> <p>The evaluation system has specific features that define high quality instructional practices however the direct links between these features and the evaluation tools and processes are not evident. OR</p> <p>The evaluation system has general features that define high quality instructional practices and directly links these features to evaluation tools and processes. OR</p> <p>Evaluation includes multiple formal and informal classroom observations that support making inferences about the quality of instruction, but the quality of the observations or structure of the observations may limit the validity of the inferences.</p> <p>Evaluation may include the protocols, processes, a rationale for, and a systematic review of classroom artifacts of instructional planning and activities but the implementation may limit the validity of inferences.</p>	<p>Educators are evaluated on the effectiveness of the quality of instruction.</p> <p>The evaluation system has specific features that define high quality instructional practices and directly links these features to evaluation tools and processes.</p> <p>Evaluation includes a sufficient number of high quality formal and informal classroom observations that support making valid inferences about the quality of instruction.</p> <p>Evaluation includes protocols, processes, a rationale for, and implementation of a systematic review of classroom artifacts, instructional planning and activities that support making valid inferences about the quality of instruction.</p>
Evidence (Prompt A1, A2, A3):	<p>Rating: U A S</p> <p>Recommendations:</p>		

	Unacceptable	Approaching Standard	On Standard
1.3 a Administrators – Quality of Educational Leadership (Leadership Standards 1,2,3 and 6)	<p>There is little or no direct assessment of the effectiveness of instructional leadership and management.</p> <p>Evaluation is based primarily on surveys and/or anecdotal information and does not build from observation and/or artifacts of administrator performance.</p> <p>Observation and/or documentation are limited in depth or focus in ways that preclude valid inferences about the quality of educational leadership that improve student learning and organizational leadership.</p>	<p>Educators are evaluated on the effectiveness of the quality of instructional leadership and management.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Evaluation includes observation OR documentation of the ways in which the educational leader improves student learning and organizational effectiveness.</p> <p>The evaluation includes direct observation of leadership (e.g., facilitating meetings, directing initiatives, oversight of curriculum development and implementation community presentations) OR analysis of artifacts of leadership efforts (e.g. planning materials, reports, evidence of success).</p> <p>The depth of the analysis of the evaluation may not sufficiently support valid inferences about the quality of educational leadership and the ability to plan for, use data and resources, and facilitate organizational change.</p>	<p>Educators are evaluated on the effectiveness of the quality of instructional leadership and management.</p> <p>Evaluation includes observation and documentation of the ways in which the educational leader improves student learning and organizational effectiveness.</p> <p>The evaluation includes direct observation of leadership (e.g., facilitating meetings, directing initiatives, oversight of curriculum development and implementation, community presentations) as well as analysis of artifacts of leadership efforts (e.g. planning materials, reports, evidence of success).</p> <p>The depth of the analysis of the evaluation supports valid inferences about the quality of educational leadership and the ability to plan for, use data and resources, and facilitate organizational change.</p>
Evidence (Prompts A1, A2, and A3):	<p>Rating: U A S</p> <p>Recommendations:</p>		

	Unacceptable	Approaching Standard	On Standard
1.3 a Support Professionals – Quality of program planning and service delivery and consultation and collaboration	<p>There is little or no direct assessment of the effectiveness of support program delivery.</p> <p>Evaluation is based primarily on surveys and/or anecdotal information and does not build from observation and/or artifacts of support professional performance.</p> <p>Observation and/or documentation are limited in depth or focus in ways that preclude valid inferences about the quality of support professional services.</p>	<p>Educators are evaluated on the effectiveness of the quality of support program delivery.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Evaluation includes observation OR documentation of the ways in which the support professional plans and delivers support services. The evaluation includes direct observation of delivery of services (e.g., consultation and collaboration with other educators, directing the program, community work) OR analysis of artifacts of program planning and delivery (e.g. planning materials, reports, evidence of success).</p> <p>The depth of the analysis of the evaluation may not sufficiently support valid inferences about the quality of support program delivery and the ability to plan for, collaborate and consult, and deliver support services to support educational efforts.</p>	<p>Educators are evaluated on the effectiveness of the quality of support program delivery.</p> <p>Evaluation includes observation and documentation of the ways in which the support professional plans and delivers support services. The evaluation includes direct observation of delivery of services (e.g., consultation and collaboration with other educators, directing the program, community work) as well as analysis of artifacts of program planning and delivery (e.g. planning materials, reports, evidence of success).</p> <p>The depth of the analysis of the evaluation supports valid inferences about the quality of support program delivery and the ability to plan for, collaborate and consult, and deliver support services to support educational efforts.</p>
Evidence (Prompts A1, A2, A3):	<p>Rating: U A S</p> <p>Recommendations:</p>		

	Unacceptable	Approaching Standard	On Standard
1.3 b Evidence of student learning	There is little or no evidence that educators are evaluated on the effectiveness of their impact on student learning in a way that is consistent with the structure provided by RIDE for all districts and meets all of the criteria of the structure.		Educators are evaluated on the effectiveness of their impact on student learning in a way that is consistent with the structure provided by RIDE for all districts and meets all of the criteria of the structure.
Evidence (Prompt A4):		<p>Rating: U A S</p> <p>Recommendations:</p>	

	Unacceptable	Approaching Standard	On Standard
1.3 c Evidence of professional responsibilities. (For teachers this is RIPTS 7, 10, and 11; for administrators RI Standards for Educational Leadership 4 and 5; and for support professionals it is professional responsibilities defined within their appropriate professional standards).	There is little or no evidence that evaluation includes assessment of the educator's demonstration of most of the professional responsibilities.	Evaluation includes assessment of the educator's demonstration of most of the professional responsibilities.	Evaluation includes assessment of the educator's demonstration of the full range of professional responsibilities.
Evidence (Prompt A5):	Rating: U A S Recommendations:		

	Unacceptable	Approaching Standard	On Standard
<p>1.3 d Evidence of content knowledge (For teachers, this is subject matter knowledge as described in RIPTS 2; for administrators and support professionals it is the content knowledge of their field)</p>	<p>There is little or no evidence that educators are evaluated on the content knowledge of their field.</p>	<p>Educators are evaluated on their content knowledge, but the assessment may not reach the depth necessary to provide assurance of accuracy and of current content knowledge.</p>	<p>Educators are evaluated on the accuracy and currency of their content knowledge.</p>
<p>Evidence (Prompt A6):</p>		<p>Rating: U A S</p> <p>Recommendations:</p>	

	Unacceptable	Approaching Standard	On Standard
1.4 Educator evaluation is integrated with and supportive of district initiatives and the district's strategic plan.	There is little or no evidence that the evaluation system integrates district initiatives into educator evaluation.	<p>The evaluation system includes a general approach for integrating district initiatives into educator evaluation but the specifics may not be systemic or may lack sufficient incentives to make it effective.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>The district makes minimal use of the approach to support initiatives.</p>	The evaluation system integrates district initiatives into educator evaluation through common performance goals (e.g., district-wide, school-wide, discipline-wide) to assure that educators develop and contribute to attaining district goals.
Evidence (Prompts C7, F4):		<p>Rating: U A S</p> <p>Recommendations:</p>	

Standard 2: District evaluation systems emphasize the professional growth and continuous improvement of individual educators' professional practice to enhance student performance.			
	Unacceptable	Approaching Standard	On Standard
2.1 Educator evaluation systems establish a cyclical process that includes the collection and analysis of information about an educator's performance, the establishment of individual goals for professional development based on the analysis, and the improvement of performance as a result of that professional development.	<p>There is little or no evidence that most educators have a written professional development plan that includes measurable annual performance goals, a plan for meeting those goals, and criteria that will demonstrate the goals have been met.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>There is little or no evidence that the evaluation system is designed to provide evidence of agreement about the evaluation analysis, identified goals, and improvement expectations and the quality of professional development plans limits their usefulness in improving individual educator practice.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>There is little or no evidence that educator evaluation is the basis for an effective professional development plan and changes to the plan are made based on attaining individual professional development goals and ongoing evaluation of performance.</p>	<p>Most educators have a written professional development plan that includes measurable annual performance goals, a plan for meeting those goals, and criteria that will demonstrate the goals have been met.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>The evaluation system is designed to provide evidence of agreement about the evaluation analysis, identified goals, and improvement expectations. However, the quality of professional development plans limits their usefulness in improving individual educator practice.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>The connection between evaluation and professional development plan is limited and/or changes to the plan may not be directly connected to goal attainment or ongoing evaluation.</p>	<p>Each educator has a written professional development plan that includes measurable annual performance goals, a plan for meeting those goals, and criteria that will demonstrate the goals have been met.</p> <p>The evaluation system is designed to provide agreement between the evaluation analysis and the identified goals and improvement expectations that inform professional development.</p> <p>Educator evaluation is the basis for an effective professional development plan and changes to the plan are made based on attaining individual professional development goals and ongoing evaluation of performance.</p>
Evidence (Prompts C1, C2):	<p>Rating: U A S</p> <p>Recommendations:</p>		

	Unacceptable	Approaching Standard	On Standard
2.2 Educator evaluation systems assure that all educators receive detailed feedback on their performance and recommendations for professional growth.	<p>There is little or no evidence that informal and formal evaluation activities yield detailed feedback that is used to inform recommendations for professional growth.</p> <p>There is little or no written feedback provided to inform recommendations for professional growth.</p>	<p>Most informal and formal evaluation activities yield detailed feedback and this feedback is used to inform recommendations for professional growth.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Informal and formal evaluation activities yield detailed feedback; however, it may not be linked to recommendations for professional growth.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Written feedback is provided but does not consistently inform recommendations for professional growth.</p>	<p>All informal and formal evaluation activities yield detailed feedback and this feedback is used to inform recommendations for professional growth.</p> <p>Written feedback is provided and informs recommendations for professional growth.</p>
Evidence (Prompt C3):	<p>Rating: U A S</p> <p>Recommendations:</p>		

	Unacceptable	Approaching Standard	On Standard
2.3 Educator evaluation systems create expectations that educators analyze their own professional practice by considering feedback from supervisors, colleagues, students and parents, confer with supervisors about their performance and use recommendations for professional growth in developing professional development goals.	<p>There is little or no evidence that the evaluation process includes mechanisms to collect, provide and use feedback on performance.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>There is little or no evidence of a clear articulation about how each feedback mechanism will be used in the evaluation cycle.</p> <p>There is little or no evidence that evidence from feedback mechanisms is used.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>There is little or no evidence that the evaluation process results in a documented individual professional development plan with goals based on individual analysis of performance and direction from supervisors.</p>	<p>The evaluation process includes mechanisms to collect, provide and use feedback on performance only from supervisors.</p> <p>There is articulation about how each feedback mechanism will be used in the evaluation cycle. Some of the evidence is used.</p> <p>The evaluation process results in a documented individual professional development plan with goals based on individual analysis of performance and direction from supervisors.</p>	<p>The evaluation process includes mechanisms to collect, provide and use feedback on performance from supervisors and from colleagues, students and/or parents, but not all three groups.</p> <p>There is a clear articulation about how each feedback mechanism will be used in the evaluation cycle and evidence that it is used.</p> <p>The evaluation process results in a documented individual professional development plan with goals based on individual analysis of performance and direction from supervisors.</p>
Evidence (Prompt C1, C4):	<p>Rating: U A S</p> <p>Recommendations:</p>		

	Unacceptable	Approaching Standard	On Standard
2.4 Educator evaluation systems collect and analyze data about individual professional development needs and identify patterns within schools and across the district to inform the development of a coherent district staff development plan.	There is little or no evidence that the district uses data from individual professional development plans to develop comprehensive professional development plans for the district.	The district collects and reviews data from individual professional development plans and may use this data in limited ways to inform professional development plans for the district.	The district aggregates data from individual professional development plans to create comprehensive professional development plans for the district.
Evidence (Prompt C5):	<p>Rating: U A S</p> <p>Recommendations:</p>		

Standard 3: District Evaluation systems create an organizational approach to the collective professional growth and continuous improvement of groups of educators’ (e.g., departments, teams, programs, schools) professional practice to enhance student performance.

	Unacceptable	Approaching Standard	On Standard
<p>3.1 Evaluation systems establish a cyclical process to collect and analyze data on the collective effectiveness of groups of educators (e.g., departments, teams, programs, schools, and district) and use the data to establish common goals for professional development based on the analysis and to improve performance as a result of that professional development.</p>	<p>There is little or no evidence that the district establishes processes that evaluate the effectiveness of groups of educators (e.g., departments, programs) and uses this data to establish organizational performance goals (e.g. in school improvement plans or district strategic plans). OR There is little or no evidence that the district has a plan for providing evidence of effectively using goal setting and professional development of groups of educators to improve district performance. OR There is little or no evidence that changes to the organizational performance goals are made based on attaining collective professional development goals and ongoing evaluation of organizational performance.</p>	<p>The district establishes processes that evaluate the effectiveness of all district educators on district goals or initiatives and uses this data to establish organizational performance goals (e.g. in school improvement plans or district strategic plans) but this is not done for groups of educators. OR The district has a plan for providing evidence of effectively using goal setting and professional development of all educators to improve district performance. OR Changes to the organizational performance goals may be made but it is not clear that these were based on attaining collective professional development goals and ongoing evaluation of organizational performance.</p>	<p>The district establishes processes that evaluate the effectiveness of groups of educators (e.g., schools, departments, programs) and uses this data to establish organizational performance goals (e.g. in school improvement plans or district strategic plans). The district has a plan for providing evidence of effectively using goal setting and professional development of groups of educators to improve district performance. Changes to the organizational performance goals are made based on attaining and reviewing collective professional development goals and ongoing evaluation of organizational performance.</p>
<p>Evidence (Prompts C6, C7):</p>	<p>Rating: U A S</p> <p>Recommendations:</p>		

	Unacceptable	Approaching Standard	On Standard
3.2 Educator evaluation systems collect and analyze data about collective professional development needs of groups of educators and identify patterns across departments, teams, programs, schools and the district to inform the development of a coherent district staff development plan.	There is little or no evidence that the district aggregates data from collective professional development plans and data about student learning, both state and local measures, to create comprehensive professional development plans for the district.	The district collects and reviews data from collective professional development plans and data about student learning, both state and local measures, and may use this data to inform professional development plans for the district.	The district aggregates data from collective professional development plans and data about student learning, both state and local measures, to create comprehensive professional development plans for the district.
Evidence (Prompt C6, C8):	Rating: U A S Recommendations:		

	Unacceptable	Approaching Standard	On Standard
<p>3.3a Evaluation systems include a process to identify individual and groups of district educators who demonstrate exemplary professional practice, impact on student learning, and/or professional responsibilities and who contribute in measurable ways to district improvement.</p>	<p>There is little or no evidence that district evaluation effectively identifies educators or groups of educators who are highly effective in their roles or demonstrate exemplary practice in key elements of their roles, or who make exceptional contributions in measurable ways to district improvement.</p> <p>There is little or no evidence that the district acknowledges these accomplishments.</p>	<p>The district evaluation system is designed to identify educators or groups of educators who are highly effective in their roles or who demonstrate exemplary practice in key elements of their roles; however the implementation may demonstrate limited success in identifying the appropriate educators.</p> <p>There is limited evidence that the district acknowledges these accomplishments.</p>	<p>The district evaluation system effectively identifies educators and groups of educators who are highly effective in their roles or demonstrate exemplary practice in key elements of their roles, or who make exceptional contributions in measurable ways to district improvement.</p> <p>The district acknowledges these accomplishments.</p>
<p>Evidence (Prompts E1, E2):</p>		<p>Rating: U A S</p> <p>Recommendations:</p>	

	Unacceptable	Approaching Standard	On Standard
3.3b The district identifies ways to recognize and capitalize on their talents through differentiated roles and responsibilities, formal recognition, and/or other incentives.	<p>There is little or no evidence that the district acknowledges highly effective educators by providing recognition and/or other incentives.</p> <p>There is little or no evidence that district capitalizes on the talents identified through its evaluation system to select exemplary educators for specialized roles and responsibilities within the district.</p>	<p>The district acknowledges highly effective educators by providing recognition and/or other incentives.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>The district capitalizes on the talents identified through its evaluation system to select exemplary educators for specialized roles and responsibilities within the district.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>The district attempts to provide recognition and/or incentives and to capitalize through special roles and/or responsibilities, but the design and implementation have limited effect within the district.</p>	<p>The district acknowledges highly effective educators by providing recognition and/or other incentives.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>The district capitalizes on the talents identified through its evaluation system to select exemplary educators for specialized roles and responsibilities within the district.</p>
Evidence (Prompts E3, E4):	<p>Rating: U A S</p> <p>Recommendations:</p>		

Standard 4: District Evaluation systems provide quality assurance of all district educators and differentiate evaluation processes based upon level of experience, job assignment, and information.

	Unacceptable	Approaching Standard	On Standard
4.1 All district educators are evaluated at least annually; however due to the cyclical nature of the evaluation the specific procedures may vary based on educator experience, assignment, and the outcome of prior evaluations.	<p>There is little or no evidence that every educator is assigned a rating based on a comprehensive evaluation every year either in an annual or multi-year cycle.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>There is little or no evidence that the evaluation report includes a written analysis of how and why the rating was determined.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>In systems that have multi-year cycles there is little or no explanation of why educators are on a multi-year cycle, what the cycles are or what evaluation components are used for educators in different cycles and justification for who gets into which cycles.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>In systems that have multi-year evaluation cycles, there is little or no evidence that there are formal and informal measures that assure that educators in non-intensive evaluation years continue to demonstrate effective educator performance and are progressing on meeting professional expectations.</p>	NO RATING HERE – UNACCEPTABLE OR ON STANDARD ONLY	<p>Every educator is assigned a rating on an annual basis as a result of comprehensive evaluation every year either in an annual or a multi-year evaluation cycle. The evaluation report includes a written analysis of how and why the rating was determined.</p> <p>Multi-year evaluation cycles provide a clear explanation of why educators are on a multi-year cycle, what the cycles are, what evaluation components are used for educators on different cycles, and justification for who gets into which cycle.</p> <p>In systems that have multi-year evaluation cycles, there are formal and informal measures that assure that educators continue to demonstrate effective educator performance and are progressing on meeting professional expectations-</p> <p>Please note that the Rhode Island model evaluates Building Administrators every year. Both Teachers and Support Professionals are eligible to enter the cyclical process. For specifics please see respective guidebooks here.</p>

Evidence (Prompt D1):	Rating: U A S Recommendations:		
	Unacceptable	Approaching Standard	On Standard
4.2a Educators who are new to the profession, new to the district, or who are new to a role category are provided with intensive support and evaluation in ways that assure that they meet expectations for educator quality within the district.	<p>The evaluation system provides little or no differentiation for educators who are new to the profession, new to the district or who are new to a role category.</p> <p>There is little or no evidence of new educator support.</p> <p>There is little or no evidence that evaluation of new educators informs tenure decisions, when appropriate.</p>	<p>New educators participate in an evaluation that addresses many of the needs of new educators for one year that involves frequent observation and extensive formative feedback designed to assure the educator attains the knowledge and skills necessary to attain a rating of effective.</p> <p>The district evaluation system creates methods for new educator support that recognize the needs of new educators.</p> <p>The evaluation of new educators informs tenure decisions when appropriate.</p>	<p>New educators participate in a comprehensive evaluation for up to five years that involves frequent observation and extensive formative feedback designed to assure the educator attains the knowledge and skills necessary to attain a rating of effective.</p> <p>The district evaluation system creates methods for new educator support that recognize the needs of new educators.</p> <p>The evaluation of new educators informs renewal and, when appropriate, tenure decisions.</p>

Evidence (Prompt D2):	Rating: U A S Recommendations:		
	Unacceptable	Approaching Standard	On Standard
4.2b Educators who change assignments within a role category are supported and evaluated based upon a district-developed transition plan that is designed to address the new knowledge and skills required by the change in position, professional development needs identified from prior evaluations, and contextual reasons for the move.	The district evaluation system fails to assure that most educators who change assignments revise their professional development plans to incorporate district developed goals that reflect the new assignments. OR There is little or no evidence of changes to professional development plans when educators change assignments within a role category. OR There is little or no evidence that the revised professional development plan identifies specific new goals, benchmarks, and a timeline for demonstrating effectiveness. OR There is little or no evidence that the professional development plan is developed by and effectively monitored by the district.	The district evaluation system assures that most educators who change assignments revise their professional development plans to incorporate district developed goals that reflect the new assignment. OR The revised professional development plan is general and lacks specific goals, benchmarks, and a timeline for demonstrating effectiveness. OR The revised professional development plan is developed by the district but may not be effectively monitored by the district.	The district evaluation system assures that all educators who change assignments revise their professional development plans to incorporate district developed goals that reflect the new assignment. The revised professional development plan identifies specific new goals, benchmarks, and a timeline for demonstrating effectiveness. The revised professional development plan is developed by and effectively monitored by the district.

Evidence (Prompt D3):	Rating: U A S Recommendations:		
	Unacceptable	Approaching Standard	On Standard
4.2c Educators who remain in the same assignment and consistently demonstrate that they meet expectations for educator quality within the district are evaluated in ways that monitor continued quality of performance and emphasize professional growth.	<p>There is little or no evidence that every educator has a comprehensive evaluation every year either in an annual or multi-year evaluation cycle.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>There is little or no evidence that multi-year evaluation cycles provide a clear explanation of why educators are on a multi-year cycle, what the cycles are, what evaluation components are used for educators on different cycles, and justification for who gets into which cycle.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>In systems that have multi-year evaluation cycles, there is little or no evidence that there are formal and informal measures (including observations) that assure that educators who are in non-intensive year evaluation continue to demonstrate effective educator performance and are progressing on meeting professional expectations.</p>	NO RATING AVAILABLE – ON STANDARD or UNACCEPTABLE	<p>Every educator has a comprehensive evaluation every year either in an annual or a multi-year evaluation year cycle. The evaluation report includes a written analysis of how and why the rating was determined.</p> <p>Multi-year evaluation cycles provide a clear explanation of why educators are on a multi-year cycle, what the cycles are, what evaluation components are used for educators on different cycles, and justification for who gets into which cycle.</p> <p>In systems that have multi-year evaluation cycles, there are formal and informal measures that assure that educators continue to demonstrate effective educator performance and are progressing on meeting professional expectations.</p> <p>Please note that the Rhode Island model evaluates Building Administrators every year. Both Teachers and Support Professionals are eligible to enter the cyclical process. For specifics please see respective guidebooks here.</p>

Evidence (Prompt D1):		Rating: U A S	
		Recommendations:	
	Unacceptable	Approaching Standard	On Standard
4.3a The district identifies a team to work with each educator to develop an improvement plan with targeted support and intervention designed to help the educator meet the district's expectations for educator quality.	<p>There is little or no evidence of appropriate action to address the performance of educators whose performance has been rated as ineffective or developing.</p> <p>There is little or no support to improve the educator's performance.</p>	<p>The district provides a team to work with all educators whose performance is rated as ineffective or developing to create a plan to improve.</p> <p>The plan provides support but it may not be sufficient support to improve the educator's performance.</p>	<p>The district provides a team to work with all educators whose performance is rated as ineffective or developing to create a plan to improve.</p> <p>The plan assures sufficient support to improve the educator's performance.</p>
Evidence Prompts D4, D5):		Rating: U A S	
		Recommendations:	

	Unacceptable	Approaching Standard	On Standard
4.3b The improvement plan includes clearly articulated objectives, benchmarks, and timelines to improve performance to an acceptable level.	<p>There is little or no evidence of appropriate action to address the performance of educators whose performance has been rated as ineffective or developing.</p> <p>There is little or no evidence that the improvement plan provides evidence that the educator worked with the evaluation team to develop the plan, goals and improvement expectations.</p>	<p>All educators whose performance is rated as ineffective or developing and who continue to work in the district are placed on an improvement plan; however the quality and specificity of the plan may provide insufficient direction to demonstrate effectiveness.</p> <p>The improvement plan provides evidence that the educator worked with the evaluation team to develop the plan, goals and improvement expectations.</p>	<p>All educators whose performance is rated as ineffective or developing and who continue to work in the district are placed on an improvement plan that identifies specific goals, benchmarks, and a timeline for demonstrating effectiveness.</p> <p>The improvement plan provides evidence that the educator worked with the evaluation team to develop the plan, goals and improvement expectations.</p>
Evidence (Prompts D4, D5):	<p>Rating: U A S</p> <p>Recommendations:</p>		

	Unacceptable	Approaching Standard	On Standard
4.3c The district identifies personnel actions that will result when the educator meets or fails to meet the expectations.	There is little or no evidence that tenure, renewal, or dismissal decisions are based on criteria in the evaluation system.	<p>The evaluation system identifies criteria for personnel actions, including tenure, renewal, or dismissal that result from educator evaluation.</p> <p>The district's evidence of application of these employment actions suggests that implementation is not consistent.</p>	<p>The evaluation system identifies criteria for personnel actions, including tenure, renewal, or dismissal that result from educator evaluation.</p> <p>The district provides evidence of consistent application of these employment actions.</p>
Evidence (Prompts D4, D5):		<p>Rating: U A S</p> <p>Recommendations:</p>	

	Unacceptable	Approaching Standard	On Standard
4.4 The district dismisses educators who do not meet expectations for educator quality and who are unwilling or unable to improve as a result of the improvement plan in a timely manner.	<p>There is little or no evidence that the district monitors educator ratings over consecutive years.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>There is little or no evidence that districts dismiss ALL educators who are rated ineffective for two consecutive years.</p>	NO RATING AVAILABLE – ON STANDARD or UNACCEPTABLE	The district monitors educator ratings over consecutive years and dismisses ALL educators who are rated ineffective for two consecutive years.
Evidence (Prompt D6):		<p>Rating: U A S</p> <p>Recommendations:</p>	
	Unacceptable	Approaching Standard	On Standard
4.5 Evaluation systems are designed to provide objective information to support meaningful renewal and tenure decisions.	There is little or no evidence that educator evaluation provides objective information that is integrated with renewal and tenure decisions.	Educator evaluation provides objective information that is integrated with renewal and tenure decisions.	Educator evaluation provides objective information that is integrated with employment and tenure decisions and is the primary determinant of renewal and tenure decisions.
Evidence (Prompt D7):		<p>Rating: U A S</p> <p>Recommendations:</p>	

Standard 5: District Evaluation systems assure fair, accurate, and consistent assessment of educator performance.

	Unacceptable	Approaching Standard	On Standard
<p>5.1 The evaluation system is transparent to all educators. The purpose, criteria, instruments, procedures, and expectations for acceptable levels of performance are clearly communicated to educators through handbooks. Districts support educators in developing a thorough understanding of the evaluation system.</p>	<p>There is little or no evidence that the evaluation system is clearly communicated to educators and many elements of the system are open to wide interpretation with little or no clear guidance for implementation.</p> <p>There is little or no evidence that purpose of the evaluation system and the criteria for meeting each of the four performance descriptions are shared and well documented.</p> <p>There is little or no evidence that the district provides support to help educators develop an understanding of the evaluation system by offering, for example, after school workshops, embedding it into induction programs, webinars, and handbooks.</p> <p>There is little or no evidence that the written evaluation system and the system as implemented are consistent, thereby diminishing the value of the written materials</p>	<p>Many elements of the system are clearly communicated to educators in the district, but there are other elements that are vague, inadequately documented, or allow for too much variation in implementation.</p> <p>The purpose of the evaluation system and the criteria for meeting each of the four performance descriptions are shared and partially documented. The purposes are written, however there is limited evidence that the evaluation purposes have been shared with educators.</p> <p>The district provides some support to help educators develop an understanding of the evaluation system by offering, for example, after school workshops, embedding it into induction programs, webinars, and handbooks. There is evidence that the written evaluation system and the system as implemented are not consistent, thereby diminishing the value of the written materials.</p>	<p>The evaluation system is transparent to all participants. This is established, for example, by providing clear evaluation components, instruction, and observation tools that are shared and understood.</p> <p>The purpose of the evaluation system and the criteria for meeting each of the four performance descriptions are shared and well documented. The purposes are written and there is evidence that the evaluation purposes have been shared with educators.</p> <p>The district provides significant support to help educators develop an understanding of the evaluation system by offering, for example, after school workshops, embedding it into induction programs, webinars, and handbooks. There is clear evidence that the written evaluation system and the system as implemented is consistent, thereby establishing the value of the written materials.</p>
<p>Evidence (Prompts A1, A2, A3, A4, A6, A7, A8, B1):</p>		<p>Rating: U A S</p> <p>Recommendations:</p>	

	Unacceptable	Approaching Standard	On Standard
5.2 The evaluation system demonstrates the validity of evaluation decisions by assuring a strong connection between the evaluation instruments and professional standards and educator roles and responsibilities.	<p>The evaluation system demonstrates a weak alignment of instruments to standards and the emphasis of evaluation is minimally aligned with the educator’s role and responsibilities within the district. The system relies on instruments that are not appropriate for the position or are not psychometrically defensible.</p> <p>There is little or no evidence that the district has a plan to study and document the system’s validity by documenting decisions, examining the correlation between professional development plans and improvements on evaluations, and has a schedule for ongoing revision based on evaluation data</p>	<p>The evaluation system demonstrates a moderate alignment of instruments to standards and the emphasis of evaluation is partially aligned with the educator’s role and responsibilities within the district.</p> <p>The district has a plan to study the system’s validity but partially documents evaluation decisions, how the correlation between professional development plans and improvements on evaluations is examined. The district has a schedule for ongoing revision based on evaluation data; however the schedule is not followed consistently.</p>	<p>The evaluation system demonstrates a strong alignment of instruments to standards and the emphasis of evaluation is closely aligned with the educator’s role and responsibilities within the district.</p> <p>The district has a plan to study and document the system’s validity by documenting decisions, examining the correlation between professional development plans and improvements on evaluations, and has a schedule for ongoing revision based on evaluation data.</p>
Evidence (Prompts A7, A8, A9):	<p>Rating: U A S</p> <p>Recommendations:</p>		

	Unacceptable	Approaching Standard	On Standard
5.3a Evaluation systems incorporate appropriate evaluation instruments, <i>including at a minimum, observations of the educator’s practice, evidence of student learning outcomes, and demonstrations of professional responsibilities.</i>	<p>The evaluation system does not incorporate observations, evidence of student learning, and demonstration of professional responsibilities.</p> <p>The combination of evaluation from these areas provides little or no assurance that evidence of student growth and academic achievement is the primary determinant of effectiveness.</p>	NO RATING AVAILABLE – ON STANDARD or UNACCEPTABLE	<p>The evaluation system incorporates observations, evidence of student learning, and demonstration of professional responsibilities.</p> <p>The combination of evaluation from these areas assures that evidence of student growth and academic achievement is the primary determinant of effectiveness.</p>
Evidence (Prompts A7, A8, A1, A2, A3, A4, A5):		<p>Rating: U A S</p> <p>Recommendations:</p>	
	Unacceptable	Approaching Standard	On Standard
5.3b Evaluation systems <i>incorporate appropriate evaluation instruments</i> , including at a minimum, observations of the educator’s practice, evidence of student learning outcomes, and demonstrations of professional responsibilities.	The quality of the evaluation instruments raises a number of significant concerns about validity, reliability and appropriateness of the evaluation instruments and/or the comprehensiveness of the educator evaluation.	The quality of the evaluation instruments raises some concerns about the validity, reliability, and appropriateness of evaluation instruments or the comprehensiveness of the educator evaluation.	The system uses instruments that are valid and reliable; that are appropriate tools to measure each intended component of an effective educator’s performance; and that assure comprehensive educator evaluation.

Evidence(Prompts A7, A8, A1, A2, A3, A4, A5):	Rating: U A S Recommendations:		
	Unacceptable	Approaching Standard	On Standard
5.4 Evaluation systems seek information from students, parents and guardians, colleagues, and supervisors, to inform an educator’s evaluation and professional development. Evaluation systems use a variety of methodologies that incorporate different types of evidence to address the range of expectations identified in the appropriate professional standards and use multiple measures, to provide a thorough assessment of the educator’s performance.	The evaluation system fails to document how it uses information from supervisors as part of the educator’s evaluation. OR The evaluation system relies primarily on one methodology. OR The evaluation system relies primarily on one measure to determine an educator’s effectiveness	The evaluation system documents how it uses information from supervisors only and uses the information as part of the educator’s evaluation. The evaluation system uses several methodologies and instruments, but they may be very similar. The evaluation system relies on a few measures that provide a limited assessment of the educator’s effectiveness.	The evaluation system documents how it uses information from supervisors and from students, parents/ guardians, or colleagues and uses the information as part of the educator’s evaluation. The evaluation system uses a variety of methodologies and instruments. The evaluation system uses multiple measures to assess an educator’s effectiveness.

Evidence (Prompt A10, A11, C4):		Rating: U A S	
		Recommendations:	
	Unacceptable	Approaching Standard	On Standard
5.5a Evaluators are selected based upon their depth of knowledge and their demonstrated expertise and are assigned based upon the subject matter knowledge, grade-level experience, and other requisite experience required to accurately use specific evaluation instruments.	There is little or no evidence that the district selects evaluators who meet clear criteria that incorporate the knowledge and experience, subject matter knowledge, grade-level experience, and any other requisite skills needed to make accurate judgments for specific evaluation instruments.	The district selects evaluators most of whom meet clear criteria that incorporate the knowledge, experience, subject matter knowledge, grade-level experience, and other requisite skills needed to make accurate judgments for specific evaluation instruments.	The district selects evaluators who meet clear criteria that incorporate the knowledge, experience, subject matter knowledge, grade-level experience, and any other requisite skills needed to make accurate judgments for specific evaluation instruments.
Evidence (Prompt A12):		Rating: U A S	
		Recommendations:	

	Unacceptable	Approaching Standard	On Standard
<p>5.5b Evaluators are trained in the implementation of the district’s evaluation instruments, demonstrate their ability to make consistent judgments, and are reviewed on a regular basis to verify they continue to make accurate judgments.</p>	<p>Many evaluators have not been trained in the use of the evaluation instruments or have not demonstrated that they are able to make consistent judgments.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>There is little or no evidence that there are processes in place that demonstrate evaluators’ judgments are calibrated on an ongoing basis and document that they continue to make accurate judgments.</p>	<p>All evaluators have been trained in the use of the evaluation instruments and have demonstrated that they are able to make consistent judgments.</p> <p>There are processes in place to demonstrate evaluators’ judgments are calibrated on an ongoing basis and document that they continue to make accurate judgments, but the judgments are not consistently applied or little or no action is taken when evaluators do not calibrate.</p>	<p>All evaluators have been trained in the use of the evaluation instruments and have demonstrated that they are able to make consistent judgments.</p> <p>There are processes in place that demonstrate evaluators’ judgments are calibrated on an ongoing basis and document that they continue to make accurate judgments.</p>
<p>Evidence (Prompts A13, A14):</p>		<p>Rating: U A S</p> <p>Recommendations:</p>	

	Unacceptable	Approaching Standard	On Standard
5.6 The evaluation system provides safeguards against possible sources of bias to ensure valid assessments. Districts review evaluation instruments for possible sources of bias in the design process and monitor implementation results for possible inappropriate adverse impact. Evaluators raise existing or potential conflicts of interest so they can be addressed. The evaluation system provides procedural safeguards (e.g., appeals) to ensure the integrity of the system.	<p>There is little or no evidence that the district has a process to ensure that evaluation systems instruments and their implementation are reviewed for possible bias and that appropriate modifications are made when necessary.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>There is little or no evidence that evaluation systems have adequate procedural safeguards to assure that all educators are treated fairly throughout the evaluation process.</p>	<p>The district has a process to ensure that evaluation system instruments and their implementation are reviewed for possible bias, but does not make appropriate modifications when necessary.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>The district reviews the design of the evaluation system instruments OR their implementation, but not both.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Evaluation systems have adequate procedural safeguards to assure that all educators are treated fairly throughout the evaluation process.</p>	<p>The district has a specific process to ensure that evaluation system instruments and their implementation are reviewed for possible bias and that appropriate modifications are made when necessary.</p> <p>Evaluation systems have adequate procedural safeguards to assure that all educators are treated fairly throughout the evaluation process.</p>
Evidence (Prompts A15, A16):	<p>Rating: U A S</p> <p>Recommendations:</p>		

Standard 6: District Evaluation systems are an integral part of the district human capital management system and are supported by district educators who regularly review and revise the system in response to systematic feedback and changing district needs.

	Unacceptable	Approaching Standard	On Standard
<p>6.1 Districts establish and support a District Evaluation Committee that includes teachers, support professionals, administrators, and union representatives. The committee solicits feedback from others (e.g., students, parents, assessment experts) who bring added perspective or expertise where appropriate. The Committee reviews the effectiveness of the evaluation system, the validity and utility of the data produced by the system, the fairness, accuracy, and consistency of decisions made, and the currency of the system. The Committee uses the information from the analysis to make recommendations for revisions to the system.</p>	<p>There is little or no evidence that an evaluation committee has been established or if it has been established that representation includes teachers, support professionals, administrators, and union representatives. OR There is little or no evidence that there are clear processes in place that specify, for example, roles, who and how members are selected and the length of their terms. OR There is little or no evidence of soliciting feedback from others to obtain added perspective. OR There is little or no evidence of ongoing collection and review of the evaluation system or recommendations to district leadership that are used to improve the evaluation system.</p>	<p>The district has an evaluation committee with membership that includes at a minimum teachers, support professionals, administrators, and union representatives. There are processes in place that specify, for example, roles, who and how members are selected and the length of their terms; however the processes may not be consistently followed. The committee’s efforts to solicit feedback from others to obtain added perspective may be very limited. The committee collects and reviews data from the system and makes recommendations to the district leadership that are used to improve the evaluation system but this is not done annually.</p>	<p>The district has an evaluation committee with membership that includes at a minimum teachers, support professionals, administrators, and union representatives. There are clear processes in place that specify, for example, roles, who and how members are selected and the length of their terms. The committee solicits feedback from others who bring added perspective or expertise where appropriate. The committee collects and reviews data from the evaluation system at least annually and uses the data to make recommendations to district leadership that are used to improve the evaluation system.</p>
<p>Evidence (Prompts F1, F2, F3, F5):</p>	<p>Rating: U A S</p> <p>Recommendations:</p>		

	Unacceptable	Approaching Standard	On Standard
<p>6.2 The District Evaluation Committee communicates data from the evaluation system to district personnel responsible for strategic planning and professional development to work collaboratively towards a coherent approach to educator quality, professional development and continuous organizational improvement.</p>	<p>There is little or no evidence of communication between the District Evaluation Committee and other district initiatives.</p> <p>There is little or no evidence that the evaluation system is integrated with district work in strategic planning and professional development.</p>	<p>The work of District Evaluation Committee is communicated to district personnel responsible for strategic planning and professional development but it is not evident that the system is integrated with these efforts.</p>	<p>The work of the District Evaluation Committee is communicated to district personnel responsible for strategic planning and professional development.</p> <p>The work of the District Evaluation Committee is integrated with district work in strategic planning and professional development. The evaluation system informs and supports these efforts.</p>
<p>Evidence (Prompt F4):</p>	<p>Rating: U A S</p> <p>Recommendations:</p>		

	Unacceptable	Approaching Standard	On Standard
6.3 The District Evaluation Committee works with district leadership to assure the resources of time, financial support, and evaluation expertise necessary to maintain the quality of the evaluation system.	There is little or no evidence that the District Evaluation Committee advises district leadership on the quality of the evaluation system, identifies what resources are necessary to maintain and improve the quality of the evaluation system, and works with the district to maintain a high quality evaluation system.	The District Evaluation Committee provides general advice to district leadership about the quality of the evaluation system but fails to identify the resources necessary to maintain and improve the quality of the evaluation system or work with the district to maintain a high quality evaluation system.	The District Evaluation Committee advises district leadership on the quality of the evaluation system, identifies what resources are necessary to maintain and improve the quality of the evaluation system, and works with the district to maintain a high quality evaluation system.
Evidence (Prompt F5):	Rating: U A S Recommendations:		

	Unacceptable	Approaching Standard	On Standard
6.4 The district is responsible for meeting the Rhode Island Department of Education's reporting requirements for assuring the quality of educator evaluation.	<p>The district fails to submit annual reports in compliance with RIDE data requests, quality control procedures, formats, and timelines.</p> <p>There is little or no evidence that the district has data systems to provide teacher classroom/course data, evaluation data (overall and by category) as specified and required by RIDE.</p>	<p>The district submits annual reports in compliance with RIDE data requests, quality control procedures, formats, and timelines, but some critical data may be missing.</p> <p>The district has data systems that provide most of the teacher classroom/course data, evaluation data (overall and by category) as specified and required by RIDE.</p>	<p>The district submits annual reports in compliance with RIDE data requests, quality control procedures, formats, and timelines.</p> <p>The district has data systems to provide teacher classroom/course data, evaluation data (overall and by category) as specified and required by RIDE.</p>
Evidence (Prompt F6):	<p>Rating: U A S</p> <p>Recommendations:</p>		